

MATROIDS: A MACAULAY2 PACKAGE

JUSTIN CHEN

ABSTRACT. We give an overview of the `Macaulay2` package `Matroids`, which contains functionality to create and compute with matroids. Examples highlighting the use of all major functions in the package are provided, along with explanations of some of the algorithms. Interesting connections of matroids to various branches and areas are also given.

INTRODUCTION. A matroid is a combinatorial object which abstracts the notions of (linear algebraic, graph-theoretic) independence. Since their introduction by Whitney [8], matroids have found diverse applications in combinatorics, graph theory, optimization, and algebraic geometry, in addition to being studied as interesting objects in their own right.

One striking feature of matroids is the multitude of distinct ways to define them. This variety of equivalent (or *cryptomorphic*) ways to characterize matroids is one of the greatest strengths of matroid theory, and one of the reasons for its ubiquity. The first and foremost definition is via bases:

Definition. Let E be a finite set, and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^E$ a set of subsets of E . The pair $(E, \mathcal{B})$ is a matroid if $\mathcal{B}$ satisfies the following conditions:

- (B1) $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$, and
- (B2) (Basis exchange) For any $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ and $b_1 \in B_1 \setminus B_2$, there exists $b_2 \in B_2 \setminus B_1$ with $B_1 \setminus \{b_1\} \cup \{b_2\} \in \mathcal{B}$.

E is called the *ground set* of the matroid $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$, $\mathcal{B}$ is the set of *bases*, and an element of $\mathcal{B}$ is a *basis*. Any subset of a basis is an *independent* set. A subset of E that is not independent is *dependent*. The minimal (with respect to inclusion) dependent sets are *circuits*.

It is easy to see that the sets of bases, independent sets, and circuits all give the same amount of information; and any one of these determines the other two: the independent and dependent sets partition 2^E , and the bases are precisely the independent sets which are maximal with respect to inclusion.

Important notes: For the reader already familiar with matroids: this package provides capabilities for converting between various representations of matroids, forming linear and graphic matroids from a matrix or graph, creating and detecting existence of minors, computing Tutte polynomials, and some additional functions for matroid applications in other areas. Each of these will in turn be illustrated with examples in this article. Virtually all notation and results mentioned below are from Oxley [5].

In this package, a matroid is, by default, internally represented by its list of bases. Moreover, the ground set is always internally treated as a list $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Although the actual elements of the ground set can be arbitrary (e.g. integers, column vectors, edges in a graph), all computations involving elements of the ground set are done by referring to an element by its index in the ground set, which is an integer in $\{0, \dots, |E|-1\}$ (in `Macaulay2`, enumeration starts at 0). For convenience, methods are provided to easily convert between an actual subset of the ground set and its list of indices.

BASIC PROPERTIES. For the latest version of the package, see ¹. We start with a minimal running example:

```
i1 : loadPackage "Matroids"
o1 = Matroids
o1 : Package
```

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05-04, 05B35, 52B40, 05C31.

¹<https://github.com/jchen419/Matroids-M2>

```

i2 : M = matroid({a,b,c,d},{0,1},{0,2})
o2 = M
o2 : Matroid

```

This creates a matroid on the ground set $\{a, b, c, d\}$ with 2 bases, whose indices (as subsets of the ground set) are $\{0, 1\}$ and $\{0, 2\}$. We can view the list of bases:

```

i3 : bases M
o3 = {set {0, 1}, set {0, 2}}
o3 : List

```

Notice that the bases are returned as sets of indices. To view the actual subsets of the ground set corresponding to the indices, use the method `groundSet` (notice that `groundSet` converts sets to lists):

```

i4 : apply(bases M, B -> groundSet_M B)
o4 = {{a, b}, {a, c}}
o4 : List

```

To convert a subset of the ground set to its list of indices, use the method `indicesOf`, which is an inverse to `groundSet`:

```

i5 : apply(oo, B -> indicesOf_M B)
o5 = {{0, 1}, {0, 2}}
o5 : List

```

So far, no attempt has been made to check that M is actually a matroid, i.e. the set of bases satisfies the basis exchange property. We verify this now, and also give a non-example:

```

i6 : isValid M
o6 = true
i7 : isValid matroid({a,b,c,d},{0,1},{2,3})
o7 = false

```

We can obtain plenty of matroid-theoretic information for this example:

```

i8 : rk M -- the rank of M = size of any basis of M
o8 = 2
i9 : rk_M {0,3} -- {0,3} corresponds to the subset {a,d}
o9 = 1
i10 : circuits M
o10 = {set {1, 2}, set {3}}
o10 : List
i11 : isDependent_M {1}
o11 = false
i12 : independents(M, 2) -- independent sets of M of size 2
o12 = {set {0, 1}, set {0, 2}}
o12 : List

```

We also recall the following definitions:

Definition. A *loop* in M is a 1-element dependent set, and a *coloop* in M is an element contained in every basis. The *closure* of a subset $A \subseteq E$ is $\overline{A} := \{x \in E \mid \text{rk}(A) = \text{rk}(A \cup \{x\})\}$. A *flat* of M is a closed subset, i.e. $A = \overline{A}$. A *hyperplane* of M is a flat of rank equal to $\text{rk } M - 1$.

```

i13 : loops M
o13 = {3}
o13 : List
i14 : coloops M
o14 = {0}
o14 : List
i15 : closure_M {2,3}
o15 = {1, 2, 3}
o15 : List
i16 : hyperplanes M

```

```

o16 = {set {0, 3}, set {1, 2, 3}}
o16 : List
i17 : flats M
o17 = {{set {3}}, {set {0, 3}, set {1, 2, 3}}, {set {0, 1, 2, 3}}}
o17 : List
i18 : fvector M
o18 = {1, 2, 1}
o18 : List

```

(here the *f-vector* records the number of flats of rank i , for $i = 0, \dots, \text{rk } M$ - notice that $f_0 = f_{\text{rk } M} = 1$ always, as the set of loops is the unique flat of rank 0 and E is the unique flat of maximal rank). We remark that the set of flats is closed under intersections, and thus (being finite, with a maximal element) is a lattice, with meet = intersection, and join given by $X \vee Y := \overline{X \cup Y}$.

Analogous to the basis exchange property, there are abstract axioms that characterize which sets of subsets of E can be the set of circuits, flats, or hyperplanes of a matroid on E . Similarly, there are axioms characterizing which functions $2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $2^E \rightarrow 2^E$ are the rank functions and closure operators of a matroid on E , respectively. Lattices of flats of matroids can also be characterized among all finite lattices. Any one of the following – bases, circuits, rank function, closure operator, lattice of flats, hyperplanes – determines all others.

CONSTRUCTING TYPES OF MATROIDS. The simplest family of matroids are the *uniform* matroids, i.e. where the set of bases equals all subsets of a fixed size:

```

i19 : U = uniformMatroid(2,4); bases U
o20 = {set {0, 1}, set {0, 2}, set {1, 2}, set {0, 3}, set {1, 3}, set {2, 3}}
o20 : List

```

Another family of fundamental importance is the class of *linear* matroids, which arise naturally from a matrix. The columns of the matrix form the ground set, and a set of column vectors is declared independent if they are linearly independent in the vector space of columns.

```

i21 : A = matrix{{0,4,-1,6},{0,2/3,7,1}}; MA = matroid A; groundSet MA
          2          4
o21 : Matrix QQ <--- QQ
o23 = {0, | 4 |, | -1 |, | 6 |}
          | 2/3 | | 7 | | 1 |
o23 : List

```

An abstract matroid M is called *representable* or *realizable* over a field k if M is isomorphic to a linear matroid over k , where an isomorphism of matroids is a bijection between ground sets that induces a bijection on bases. We verify that the matroid M we started with is isomorphic to MA , hence is representable over $\mathbb{Q}$:

```

i24 : isomorphic(MA, M)
Isomorphism: {3, 1, 0, 2}
o24 = true

```

Note that the bijection giving the isomorphism is printed: here $\{3, 1, 0, 2\}$ represents the permutation σ of $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ with $\sigma(0) = 3, \sigma(1) = 1, \sigma(2) = 0, \sigma(3) = 2$. This indicates that the map $f : MA \rightarrow M$ sending the i^{th} element of MA to the $\sigma(i)^{\text{th}}$ element of M is an isomorphism.

An important class of representable matroids (over any field) are the *graphic* matroids, derived from a graph. If G is a graph, then the graphic matroid $M(G)$ has ground set equal to the edge set of G , and circuits given by cycles in G (a cycle in G is a connected subgraph where every vertex has degree 2).

This package uses the **Graphs** package to provide functionality for creating and obtaining information about graphs. Conversely, the graphic matroid also captures a great deal of information about the graph, much of which has (at the time of this writing) not yet been exposed by the **Graphs** package.

The first example of this is the set of cycles. As the graphic matroid is defined in terms of the cycles of the graph, it was important for this package to have an efficient method of listing all cycles. To this end, two methods are provided in this package: a local helper function which returns all closed walks of a given length centered at a given vertex, and a global wrapper function which identifies oppositely oriented closed walks into a single cycle

(each cycle through a vertex v gives rise to exactly 2 closed walks at v , by reversing orientation). The global wrapper function also includes significant optimizations to speed up computation time, such as eliminating cases with few cycles before starting a search, and recursively deleting all previously visited vertices.

In the end though, finding all cycles is an NP-complete problem (e.g. existence of a Hamiltonian cycle can be simply read off from the list of cycles), so efficiency is – even theoretically – still limited. In real use cases, the algorithm performs quite well for relatively small graphs; the sparser the better.

```
i25 : time #getCycles generalizedPetersenGraph(5,2)
      -- used 0.0597035 seconds
o25 = 57
i26 : time #getCycles completeGraph 8
      -- used 1.64614 seconds
o26 = 8018
i27 : K5 = completeGraph 5
o27 = Graph{0 => {1, 2, 3, 4}}
      1 => {0, 2, 3, 4}
      2 => {0, 1, 3, 4}
      3 => {0, 1, 2, 4}
      4 => {0, 1, 2, 3}

o27 : Graph
i28 : M5 = matroid K5; groundSet M5
o29 = {set {0, 1}, set {0, 2}, set {0, 3}, set {0, 4}, set {1, 2}, set {1, 3}, set {1, ...
o29 : List
i30 : #bases M5
o30 = 125
```

The above computation verifies Cayley's theorem, which states that the number of spanning trees on n vertices is n^{n-2} (note that the bases of the graphic matroid are precisely the spanning trees, when the underlying graph is connected).

As one may suspect from the discussion on cycles, the graphic matroid is created from the list of cycles, i.e. by specifying circuits. This can be done for an abstract matroid as well, using the optional argument `EntryMethod` `=> "circuits"` in the constructor function. Regardless of the value of `EntryMethod`, the bases are automatically computed upon creation. We recreate the matroid M from before, by specifying its circuits. Note that two matroids are considered equal iff they have the same set of bases and same size ground sets, or equivalently, the identity permutation is an isomorphism between them.

```
i31 : M1 = matroid({a,b,c,d},{1,2},{3}), EntryMethod => "circuits", TargetRank => 2)
o31 = M1
o31 : Matroid
i32 : M == M1
o32 = true
```

Often specific matroids of importance are close to uniform, in the sense that relatively few subsets of size $\text{rk } M$ are dependent, so the set of *nonbases* (i.e. dependent sets of size $\text{rk } M$) can also be specified, using `EntryMethod` `=> "nonbases"`.

```
i33 : fanoNB = {{0,1,2},{0,4,5},{0,3,6},{1,3,5},{1,4,6},{2,3,4},{2,5,6}};
i34 : F7 = matroid(toList (1..7), fanoNB, EntryMethod => "nonbases"); #bases F7
o35 = 28
```

We can also construct a new matroid from smaller ones by taking *direct sums*: if $M_1 = (E_1, \mathcal{B}_1)$ and $M_2 = (E_2, \mathcal{B}_2)$ are matroids, then their direct sum is $M_1 \oplus M_2 := (E_1 \sqcup E_2, \{B_1 \sqcup B_2 \mid B_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2\})$.

```
i36 : S = directsum(U, matroid completeGraph 3); groundSet S
o37 = {(0, 0), (1, 0), (2, 0), (3, 0), (set {0, 1}, 1), (set {0, 2}, 1), (set {1, 2}, 1)}
o37 : List
i38 : bases S
o38 = {set {0, 1, 4, 6}, set {0, 1, 4, 5}, set {0, 1, 5, 6}, set {0, 2, 4, 6}, set {0, ...
```

```
o38 : List
```

Notice that although elements of the ground set of the direct sum receive a placeholder index to ensure disjointness (and thus become increasingly more complex with repeated direct sums), the bases only change by shifting the indices of the second argument up. This is one instance where the representation of bases as indices is more useful than as elements.

A matroid that cannot be written as a direct sum of nonempty matroids is called *connected* or *irreducible*. Every matroid is a direct sum of connected matroids, its *connected components*. To find the connected components, use the method `componentsOf`:

```
i39 : C = componentsOf S
o39 = {Matroid, Matroid}
o39 : List
i40 : S == directsum(C#0, C#1)
o40 = true
```

DUALITY AND MINORS. One of the most important features of matroid theory is the existence of a duality. It is straightforward to check that if $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$ is a matroid, then $\{E - B \mid B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ also satisfies (B1) and (B2), and thus is the set of bases of a matroid on E , called the *dual matroid* of M , denoted by M^* .

```
i41 : D = dualMatroid M; bases D
o42 = {set {2, 3}, set {1, 3}}
o42 : List
i43 : M == dualMatroid D
o43 = true
i44 : loops D
o44 = {0}
o44 : List
i45 : circuits D
o45 = {set {1, 2}, set {0}}
o45 : List
```

Notice that loops of D are coloops of M , and circuits of D are complements of hyperplanes of M (this is in fact how the method `hyperplanes` works). Indeed, virtually any matroid-theoretic property or operation can be enriched by considering its dual version, which is often distinct, and/or interesting as well. One such operation is deletion, which dualizes to contraction, which we discuss now:

Definition. Let $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$ be a matroid, and $S \subseteq E$. The *restriction* of M to S , denoted $M|_S$, is the matroid on S with bases $\{B \cap S \mid B \in \mathcal{B}, |B \cap S| = \text{rk } S\}$. The *deletion* of S , denoted $M \setminus S$, is the restriction of M to $E - S$. The *contraction* of M by S , denoted M/S , is defined as $(M^* \setminus S)^*$.

```
i46 : N1 = deletion_M {3}; (groundSet N1, bases N1)
o47 = ({a, b, c}, {set {0, 1}, set {0, 2}})
o47 : Sequence
i48 : N2 = contraction_M {1}; (groundSet N2, bases N2)
o49 = ({a, c, d}, {set {0}})
o49 : Sequence
```

A *minor* of M is any matroid which can be obtained from M by a sequence of deletions and contractions. It is a fact that any minor of M is of the form $(M/X) \setminus Y$ for X, Y disjoint subsets of E (in fact, even more can be said about the structure of minors, as we shall see shortly).

```
i50 : minorM5 = minor(M5, {9}, {3,5,8}) -- contracts {9}, then deletes {3,5,8}
o50 = minorM5
o50 : Matroid
i51 : (groundSet minorM5, #bases minorM5)
o51 = ({set {0, 1}, set {0, 2}, set {0, 3}, set {1, 2}, set {1, 4}, set {2, 3}}, 16)
o51 : Sequence
```

Minor-theoretic properties can be used to describe many important classes of matroids. For example, a class $\mathcal{C}$ of matroids is said to be *minor-closed* if every minor of a matroid in $\mathcal{C}$ is again in $\mathcal{C}$. The classes of uniform, k -representable (for arbitrary k), and graphic matroids are all minor-closed. Furthermore, certain classes of matroids can be characterized by their *forbidden* or *excluded* minors, namely the matroids not in the class, but with every proper minor in the class.

Theorem 1. (Tutte) [6, 7] *Let M be a matroid.*

- i) M is binary (i.e. representable over $\mathbb{F}_2$) iff M has no $U_{2,4}$ minor (i.e. no minor of M is isomorphic to $U_{2,4}$).*
 - ii) M is regular (i.e. representable over any field) iff M has no $U_{2,4}$, F_7 , or F_7^* minor.*
 - iii) M is graphic iff M has no $U_{2,4}$, F_7 , F_7^* , $M(K_5)^*$, or $M(K_{3,3})^*$ minor.*
- Here $U_{2,4}$ is the uniform matroid of rank 2 on 4 elements, and F_7 is the Fano matroid.*

We illustrate this by verifying that $M(K_5)$ is regular (alternatively, one can simply write down a 0-1 matrix representing $M(K_5)$):

```
i52 : hasMinor(M5, U)
o52 = false
i53 : hasMinor(M5, F7)
o53 = false
i54 : hasMinor(M5, dualMatroid F7)
o54 = false
```

A word about the algorithm behind the method `hasMinor` is in order. First, the problem of testing for minors (even a fixed minor among a specific class of matroids) is NP-complete. Despite this, there are significantly fewer checks necessary to determine existence of a minor than may initially seem. Indeed, every minor of M is in fact of the form $(M/I) \setminus I^*$, where I, I^* are disjoint, I is independent, and I^* is *coindependent* (i.e. is independent in M^*). Such a minor has rank equal to that of M/I , which in turn equals $\text{rk } M - |I|$. Thus checking existence of a minor N in M can be realized as a two-step process, where the first step contracts independent sets of M of a fixed size down to the rank of N , and the second step deletes coindependent sets down to the size of N .

In the case of a successful minor test, the sets I and I^* are printed (as well as the isomorphism from $(M/I) \setminus I^*$ to N as usual). Note that the indices of I, I^* are given with respect to the ground set of M (as opposed to giving the indices of I^* with respect to the ground set of M/I), to agree with the syntax of the method `minor`.

```
i55 : M4 = matroid completeGraph 4
o55 = M4
o55 : Matroid
i56 : hasMinor(M5, M4)
Isomorphism: matroids are equal
Contract set {9}, delete set {3, 5, 8}
o56 = true
i57 : minorM5 == M4
o57 = true
```

Finally, the single most useful piece of information about a matroid that can be obtained from deletions and contractions is the *Tutte polynomial* $T_M(x, y)$. It is a bivariate polynomial with integer coefficients which satisfies the *deletion-contraction recurrence*

$$T_M(x, y) = T_{M \setminus e}(x, y) + T_{M/e}(x, y), \quad e \in E \text{ not a loop or coloop}$$

with the initial condition $T_M(x, y) = x^a y^b$ if M consists of a coloops and b loops.

```
i58 : tuttePolynomial M5
      6      5      4      3      4      3      2      2      3      2      2
o58 = y  + 4y  + x  + 5x*y  + 10y  + 6x  + 10x y  + 15x*y  + 15y  + 11x  + 20x*y  + 15y  ...
o58 : ZZ[x, y]
```

The Tutte polynomial is the universal invariant satisfying deletion-contraction, in the sense that any numerical invariant of matroids which satisfies a (weighted) deletion-contraction recurrence is an evaluation of the Tutte polynomial, up to a scale factor. For instance, the number of bases is equal to $T_M(1, 1)$:

```
i59 : tutteEvaluate(M5, 1, 1)
o59 = 125
```

Even for graphic matroids, the Tutte polynomial contains a wealth of information about the graph; e.g. the Tutte polynomial specializes to the chromatic polynomial, the flow polynomial, and the reliability polynomial. For specific points, $T_{M(G)}(2, 1)$ counts the number of forests in G , and $T_{M(G)}(2, 0)$ counts the number of acyclic orientations of G .

```
i60 : tutteEvaluate(M5, 2, 1)
o60 = 291
i61 : tutteEvaluate(M5, 2, 0)
o61 = 120
i62 : factor chromaticPolynomial K5
o62 = (x)(x - 4)(x - 3)(x - 2)(x - 1)
o62 : Expression of class Product
```

CONNECTIONS. We conclude by presenting some connections of matroids to other areas of mathematics. First, the matroid polytope P_M : let $M = ([n], \mathcal{B})$ be a matroid on the ground set $\{1, \dots, n\}$. In the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ with standard basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, one can form the convex hull of the indicator vectors of the bases of M , namely:

$$P_M := \text{conv} \left(\sum_{i \in B} e_i \mid B \in \mathcal{B} \right)$$

The matroid polytope can be created as follows:

```
i63 : needsPackage "Polyhedra"
o63 = Polyhedra
o63 : Package
i64 : convexHull matroidPolytope M4
o64 = {ambient dimension => 6
      dimension of lineality space => 0
      dimension of polyhedron => 5
      number of facets => 16
      number of rays => 0
      number of vertices => 16
o64 : Polyhedron
```

A theorem of Gelfand, Goresky, MacPherson, and Serganova [3] classifies the subsets $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ which are the bases of a matroid on $[n]$ in terms of the polytope P_M .

Next is optimization: let E be a finite set, and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ a set of subsets that is downward closed: i.e. if $X \in \mathcal{I}$ and $Y \subseteq X$, then $Y \in \mathcal{I}$. Let w be a weight function on E , i.e. a function $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, extended to $w : 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by setting $w(X) := \sum_{x \in X} w(x)$. Consider the optimization problem:

(*) Find a maximal member of $\mathcal{I}$ of maximum weight, with respect to w .

One attempt to try to solve (*) is to apply the greedy algorithm: namely, after having already selected elements $\{x_1, \dots, x_i\}$, choose an element $x_{i+1} \in E$ of maximum weight such that $\{x_1, \dots, x_i, x_{i+1}\} \in \mathcal{I}$, and repeat. It turns out that the greedy algorithm will always work if $\mathcal{I}$ is the independent sets of a matroid, and for nothing else in general, as the following theorem shows (curiously, this was proved before Whitney introduced matroids):

Theorem 2. [2] *Let E be a finite set, and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$. Then $\mathcal{I}$ is the set of independent sets of a matroid on E iff $\mathcal{I}$ is downward closed and for all weight functions $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the greedy algorithm successfully solves (*).*

A solution to (*) provided by the greedy algorithm can be obtained using the method `greedyAlgorithm` (the weight function is specified by its list of values on E):

```
i65 : w = {0, log(2), 4/3, 1, -4, 2, pi_RR};
```

```
i66 : greedyAlgorithm(F7, w)
o66 = {6, 5, 3}
o66 : List
```

Last but not least is algebraic geometry: analogous to an Orlik-Solomon algebra (the cohomology ring of the complement of a hyperplane arrangement), one can define a cohomology ring associated to a matroid. For a matroid M on ground set E with no loops, set

$$R := \mathbb{Z}[x_F]/(I_1 + I_2),$$

$$I_1 := \left(\sum_{i_1 \in F} x_F - \sum_{i_2 \in F} \mid i_1, i_2 \in E \text{ distinct} \right),$$

$$I_2 := (x_F x_{F'} \mid F, F' \text{ incomparable})$$

where F (and F') runs over all nonempty proper flats of M . When M is realizable over $\mathbb{C}$, R is the cohomology ring of the complement of a subspace arrangement corresponding to the lattice of flats of M , without the minimal and maximal elements. It is easy to see that (taking R with coefficients in a field k instead of $\mathbb{Z}$) R is a standard graded Artinian k -algebra of Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity $r = \text{rk } M - 1$. A recent result of Adiprasito, Katz, and Huh [1] states that R is a Poincaré duality algebra (in particular, is Gorenstein), and also satisfies the Lefschetz property: for sufficiently general $l \in R_1$, and for $j \leq r/2$, multiplication by l^{r-2j} is an isomorphism $R_j \rightarrow R_{r-j}$. We illustrate the Gorenstein property for R with the Vamos matroid (the smallest matroid not realizable over any field):

```
i67 : V = specificMatroids("vamos")
o67 = V
o67 : Matroid
i68 : (#groundSet V, #bases V, rk V, #flatten flats V)
o68 = (8, 65, 4, 79)
o68 : Sequence
i69 : I = idealCohomologyRing V; -- ideal in polynomial ring with 77 = 79 - 2 variables
o69 : Ideal of QQ[x1, x2, x3, x4, x5, x6, x7, x8, x9, x10, x11, x12, x13, x14, x15, x1 ...]
i70 : time toList(0..rk V)/(i -> hilbertFunction(i, I))
-- used 32.3128 seconds
o70 = {1, 70, 70, 1}
o70 : List
```

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. This project was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1001867. The author is very grateful to June Huh for explaining the connection of the cohomology ring of a matroid. The author would also like to thank David Eisenbud and Daniel Grayson for advice with Macaulay2, and Joe Kileel for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adiprasito, K., Katz, E., and Huh, J. *Hodge theory for combinatorial geometries*. In preparation.
- [2] Borůvka, O. *O jistém problému minimálním*. Práce Mor. Přírodoved. Spol. v Brně **3**, 37-58, 1926.
- [3] Gelfand, I. M., Goresky, R. M., MacPherson, R. D., and Serganova, V. V. *Combinatorial geometries, convex polyhedra, and Schubert cells*. Advances in Mathematics **63** (3): 301-316, 1987.
- [4] Grayson, D. R. and Stillman, M. E. *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>
- [5] Oxley, J. G. *Matroid Theory*. Second Edition, Oxford University Press, New York, 2011.
- [6] Tutte, W. T. *A homotopy theorem for matroids, I, II*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **88**, 144-174, 1958.
- [7] Tutte, W. T. *Matroids and graphs*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **90**, 527-552, 1959.
- [8] Whitney, H. *On the abstract properties of linear dependence*. Amer. J. Math. **57**, 509-533, 1935.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA, 94720 U.S.A
E-mail address: jchen@math.berkeley.edu